

system is self-contained. See Figs. 3 and 4 and the description thereof, for example. The word "self-contained" appears on page 5, line 9. Sure, the self-contained container includes "batteries" and other elements including a "pair of such DC outlets 26 are schematically in Fig. 3. Notice the "+" and "-" signs. The last paragraph on page 3 of the office action is essentially a repetition of paragraph 9 rejection all the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 and rebutted above.

The applicant insists that all of the claims were written in a professional manner by a professional who has adjudged thousands of claims while being employed in the US Patent Office for 26 years. The applicant refuses to revise all the claims completely. Sure, there are some minor errors that will be corrected. The examiner states "that the above mentioned corrections are in no way complete and thorough". How many more are there?

The examiner admonishes the applicant to not only correct the indefinite and functional and operational languages mentioned. This sentence is not understood at all. It seems that when the claims are corrected as to functional and indefinite language, they should conform to 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph. What else is there?

The examiner on pages 5 and 6 admonishes the applicant to submit an amendment which clarifies the disclosure so that the examiner may make a proper comparison with the prior art. It is believed that the disclosure as written can readily be analyzed and understood by one having ordinary skill in this art.

Claims 1 - 7, 10, 11, 14 - 18 as best as understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staschik.

This reference discloses a stand-alone module that contains everything that is needed in operating a house that has no other connections to the utilities of a community. It is so huge that it has to be trucked to the house and lifted into place by a crane or other facility. The electricity is generated by a diesel engine but there is a hint that it may also be supplied by way of wind mill power or by way of a photo

voltaic system control panel. There is no indication at all where the solar panels are located. They surely are not located in the stand-alone unit 10.

In contrast to the Staschik reference, applicant's apparatus is fully contained within a self-contained unit, that is, a water filter, a reverse osmosis system, batteries and electrical inverters readily movable by hand. Applicant's apparatus is a combination of proven existing technology assembled into wheeled container, see Figs. 3 and 4. The apparatus is self-contained including the solar panels carried or in the claimed container. The container is readily movable by hand and can be moved to any location, so that the solar panels can be deployed., remotely by wire or by an outside location. The solar panels will even work on a cloudy day but with a somewhat reduced efficiency at about 80% capacity.

This all is being expressed in the modified claims 1 and 10 and therefore, claims 1 and 10 should be allowable including all the claims depending therefrom.

It is believed that claims 1 and 10 clearly define over the patent to Starschik and any rejection over Starschik in view of WO should be moot.

Turning now to the Conclusion on page 8, including the

4a) Applicant's response

The applicant is fully aware of including the need that all applicants must sign, the answer is: there is only one applicant.

All responses must be type written (a long established practice).

The type written page is double spaced.

4b) and 4c); Amendments to the specification and to the claims

It is believed that the examiner is wrong in advising the applicant how to make changes to the specification. The sample supplied is incorrect. Any changes made to the specification must make changes by duplicating the total paragraph in which the changes occur. It used to be that a "marked-up" copy had to be supplied in addition to a "clean" copy. This requirement has been revised in that the clean copy